REMARKS

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are presently pending. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 (sic) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshioka (JP 2001-124173) (hereafter "Yoshioka"). Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka in view of Hattori (JP 2000-390458) (hereafter "Hattori").

In response, Claim 1 has been canceled, Claims 4 and 5 have been amended and new Claims 17 – 26 have been added to the Application.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, the subject Application with the new and amended claims is deemed to properly present claims patentable over Yoshioka and Yoshioka and Hattori. Reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scope of which Claim 17 is illustrative. Claim 17 recites:

> 17. A leadscrew drive system comprising:
> a leadscrew follower: and
> a cylindrically shaped leadscrew shell having **a ratio of annular thickness to cylindrical diameter within a range of about 0.0004 to about 0.01.** (Emphasis added.)

The cited references do not teach or disclose the invention as presently claimed. That is, the Yoshioka and Hattori abstracts do not teach or disclose **a leadscrew having a ratio of annular thickness to cylindrical diameter within a range of about 0.0004 to about 0.01.**

The Examiner stated in reference to Claims 4 and 5 that even though Yoshioka does not indicate thickness, "it would have been obvious to one in the art to vary the size of the screw, including the thickness of the shell, in order to reduce material cost and to reduce the weight of the device. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art." (Office Action, page 3, second paragraph.) The

Claims, however, recite as a limitation a **ratio** and not just a thickness. The particular ratios are especially important when miniaturization is an objective as set forth in the specification of the Application. Neither the abstracts of Yoshioka nor Hattori teach or suggest the ratio limitations of the Claims. The same contentions apply to new Claim 17 as well. In Claim 17, the limitation is a ratio within the range of 0.0004 to 0.01.

In some of the new claims, such as Claims 18, there is an additional limitation regarding the material of the leadscrew, namely, that the leadscrew is formed of an electroless deposited nickel-based matrix with polytetrafluoroethylene particles. The Examiner stated that even though "Yoshioka does not appear to disclose the material of the screw as being nickel-based...it would have been obvious to...form the screw from a nickel-based material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of it suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice." (Office Action, page 3, third paragraph.) The claimed material, an electroless deposited nickel-based matrix with polytetrafluoroethylene particles, has not been factually shown to be a material known to a worker having general skill in the art as required by MPEP§ 2141 (which requires facts and not mere conclusory statements), and Hattori's use of manganese-nickel-copper alloy does not show as a fact knowledge of a material beyond the particular alloy mentioned.

In view of the above amendments and new claims and the contentions stated above, it is believed that the presented claims should be allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Gabor Devenyi

By _____
William J. Benman, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,014

Benman Brown & Williams
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2740
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 553-2400
(310) 553-2675 facsimile